UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

KUMIKO MORIOKA, an individual,

Plaintiff,

Case No:

v.

Hon.

IBIDEN U.S.A. CORPORATION, a

Mag.

foreign corporation,

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

Defendant.

Kumiko Morioka Pro Se 16772 Quakertown Lane Livonia, MI 48154

morikumi39@yahoo.com

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Kumiko Morioka states the following allegations:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION & VENUE

- 1. Defendant IBIDEN U.S.A. CORPORATION ("Ibiden") is a foreign corporation that manufactures and sells a variety of technological products, and conducts business in Oakland County, Michigan.
- 2. Plaintiff Kumiko Morioka ("Ms. Nugent") is a former employee of Ibiden.

- 3. This court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and over state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 4. Venue in this Court is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the events giving rise to this claim took place in this judicial district, and Defendant resides in this judicial district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 5. Ms. Morioka was hired by IBIDEN as a temporary worker in February of 2019.
- 6. After she worked at IBIDEN for a month, Ms. Morioka was hired as a full-time employee in March of 2019, beginning on April 1, 2019.
- 7. Ms. Morioka is an American citizen but was hired as one of three Japanese staff level workers at IBIDEN in the Detroit office. While she was working at IBIDEN, she became aware that IBIDEN had decided that it wanted to have at most three Japanese workers in its Detroit office for junior positions like those held by Ms. Morioka.
- 8. Ms. Morioka worked hard and performed her duties diligently and satisfactorily. She also had a cordial and professional relationship with Ms. Watanabe.
- 9. Ms. Morioka, however, was uncomfortable with Ms. Watanabe's improper behavior in the workplace. It began with Ms. Watanabe's relatively harmless, but inappropriate "jokes." For example, on more than one occasion, she told

her subordinates, including Ms. Morioka, that if they made a mistake, she would "whip/beat" them "100 times," or words to that effect. Ms. Morioka simply brushed these types of comments off as office banter.

- 10. Ms. Watanabe would also mock American workers in adjoining offices, deriding their physical appearance: in one case, she began referring to one woman who worked in a nearby suite as "Itochu lady," her pejorative way of calling someone an "old fashioned girl."
- American workers. In one case, she told Mr. Morioka that she did not like the "smokey smell" of an African American temporary worker, even though the woman did not actually smell and several of the other workers in the office also smoked. She also told Ms. Morioka that she did not like a different African American employee, and that she purposefully avoided speaking to her.
- 12. Ms. Watanabe also seemed to dislike a co-worker in the IBIDEN Indiana office who was of Chinese descent. She would refer to him as "creepy" behind his back, and called him disgusting, telling a story where he supposedly ate a chicken comb at a restaurant in California. And, when the employee suffered what was believed to be a mild cerebral infarction, Ms. Watanabe stated that she wished that "it were actually serious," or words to that effect.

- 13. Despite the challenging environment, Ms. Morioka continued to perform her job. She and other workers did have discussions about work items and corrections (as takes place in most work places), Ms. Watanabe did not raise or characterize these issues with Ms. Morioka's overall performance. In fact, the feedback she received about her performance was largely positive.
- 14. In September of 2019, the Detroit office of IBIDEN hired Ms. Ishikawa as a temporary worker. Ms. Ishikawa is approximately 13 years younger than Ms. Morioka, and a Japanese national. Ms. Watanabe immediately befriended Ms. Ishikawa. Ms. Morioka became concerned because she could immediately sense Ms. Watanabe's preference for her younger co-worker and was also aware of the informal three Japanese worker quota.
- 15. Ms. Watanabe's behavior toward Ms. Morioka completely shifted. Ms. Watanabe soon began giving Ms. Morioka the proverbial cold-shoulder and would ignore Ms. Morioka, including when Ms. Morioka would greet her.
- 16. Ms. Watanabe also began making unpleasant and discriminatory comments to Ms. Morioka, clearly intended to convey her animus because of Ms. Morioka's age. On one occasion, for example, she told Ms. Morioka that Ms. Morioka "smelled like a grandmother," and that she needed to escape from Ms. Morioka.

- 17. Ms. Watanabe also began to take other acts intended to harass Ms. Morioka. She would, for example, mark Ms. Morioka as "off" for a particular day, even though she knew that Ms. Morioka was actually working that day.
- 18. And when Ms. Morioka would make a mistake, Ms. Watanabe apparently began raising the mistakes directly with Ted Yasuda, the General Manager of the Detroit office, behind Ms. Morioka's back something that Ms. Watanabe had not done previously.
- 19. In October of 2019, Ms. Morioka reported the abusive behavior to Mr. Yasuda. But Mr. Yasuda's only response was that there was nothing that he could do because this was just Ms. Watanabe's personality.
- 20. On January 28, 2020, a human resources administrator from California came to the Detroit office and told Mr. Morioka that she had been terminated.
- 21. When Ms. Morioka asked the reason for her termination, the administrator claimed that Ms. Morioka's performance was low, and upon information and belief, Ms. Morioka never raised any issues with Ms. Morioka directly regarding her performance, and only began complaining to Mr. Yasuda behind her back after the arrival of Ms. Ishikawa.
- 22. Ms. Morioka timely filed a charge with the EEOC on or about November 16, 2020 alleging discrimination based on her national origin and because of her age. Ms. Morioka received a right to sue letter dated May 7, 2021.

COUNT I AGE DISCRIMINATION 29 U.S.C. § 621, ET SEQ.

(against Defendant)

- 23. Plaintiff incorporates and restates all previously stated allegations.
- 24. Plaintiff, who was over 50 years old during all relevant times and therefore was a member of the protected class.
 - 25. Defendant is an employer subject to 29 U.S.C. § 621, et seq.
- 26. Plaintiff was subjected to biased performance evaluation and eventual termination because of her age.
- 27. Plaintiff was qualified but was terminated in favor of keeping a younger woman.
- 28. Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff has caused Plaintiff significant harm.

COUNT II AGE DISCRIMINATION ELLIOTT-LARSEN CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, M.C.L. § 37.2202

(against Defendant)

- 29. Plaintiff incorporates and restates all previously stated allegations.
- 30. Plaintiff, who was over 50 years old during all relevant times and therefore was a member of the protected class.
- 31. Defendant is an "employer" within the meaning of M.C.L. § 37.2201(a).

- 32. Plaintiff was subjected to biased performance evaluation and eventual termination because of her age.
- 33. Plaintiff was qualified but was terminated in favor of keeping a younger woman.
- 34. Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff has caused Plaintiff significant harm.

COUNT III NATIONALITY DISCRIMINATION TITLE VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2

(against Defendant)

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates and restates all previously stated allegations.
- 36. Defendant is an "employer" subject to Title VII.
- 37. Defendant maintained an informal quota in terms of the maximum number of Japanese employees that it would keep in its Detroit office.
- 38. Plaintiff was qualified for the positions. Plaintiff is an American citizen but has a Japanese heritage.
- 39. Plaintiff was qualified but was terminated in order to reduce the number of "Japanese" workers in the Detroit office to below the informal maximum.
- 40. Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff has caused Plaintiff significant harm.
 - 41. The discriminatory treatment caused Plaintiff significant harm.

COUNT IV NATIONALITY DISCRIMINATION ELLIOTT-LARSEN CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, M.C.L. § 37.2202

(against Defendant)

- 42. Plaintiff incorporates and restates all previously stated allegations.
- 43. Defendant is an "employer" within the meaning of M.C.L. § 37.2201(a).
- 44. Defendant maintained an informal quota in terms of the maximum number of Japanese employees that it would keep in its Detroit office.
- 45. Plaintiff was qualified for the positions. Plaintiff is an American citizen but has a Japanese heritage.
- 46. Plaintiff was qualified but was terminated in order to reduce the number of "Japanese" workers in the Detroit office to below the informal maximum.
- 47. Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff has caused Plaintiff significant harm.
 - 48. The discriminatory treatment caused Plaintiff significant harm.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Plaintiff seeks all available relief and remedies, including:

- a. compensatory damages;
- b. exemplary/punitive damages;
- c. fees, costs, and interest;

all other relief, equitable and otherwise, allowed by law and deemed d. appropriate by the judge or jury.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where caserelated papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

August 5, 2021

Pro Se

16772 Quakertown Lane

Livonia, MI 48154

(248) 697-4503

morikumi39@yahoo.com

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Ms. Morioka hereby demands a trial by jury as to all of those issues so triable as of right.

Respectfully submitted,

August 5, 2021

Kumiko Morioka

Pro Se

16772 Quakertown Lane

Livonia, MI 48154

(248) 697-4503

morikumi39@yahoo.com

JS 44 (Rev. 10/20) Case 2:21-cv-11806-SJM-KGA, ECF No. 1. PageID 11 Filed 08/05/21 Page 11 of 12 Oakland Cty The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DEFENDANTS KUMIKO MORIOKA IBIDEN U.S.A. CORPORATION (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Oakland Ctv. Oakland Ctv. County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) Alan Kaplan Masuda, Funai, Eifert & Mitchell, Ltd. 7105U 200 N. Martingale Road, Suite 800, Schaumburg, IL 60173 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question PTF DEE PTF DEF Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State Incorporated or Principal Place \square 4 of Business In This State U.S. Government 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State 2 Incorporated and Principal Place Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) of Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation ☐ 6 □ 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions. CONTRACT TORTS FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 625 Drug Related Seizure 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 375 False Claims Act 120 Marine 310 Airplane 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 881 423 Withdrawal 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Product Liability 690 Other 28 USC 157 3729(a)) 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability 367 Health Care/ 400 State Reapportionment 50 Recovery of Overpayment 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical PROPERTY RIGHTS 410 Antitrust & Enforcement of Judgmen Slander Personal Injury 820 Copyrights 430 Banks and Banking 151 Medicare Act 330 Federal Employers' Product Liability 830 Patent 450 Commerce 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability 368 Asbestos Personal 835 Patent - Abbreviated 460 Deportation Student Loans 340 Marine Injury Product New Drug Application 470 Racketeer Influenced and (Excludes Veterans) 345 Marine Product Liability 840 Trademark Corrupt Organizations 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY LABOR 880 Defend Trade Secrets 480 Consumer Credit of Veteran's Benefits 350 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Fraud 710 Fair Labor Standards Act of 2016 (15 USC 1681 or 1692) 160 Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle 371 Truth in Lending Act 485 Telephone Consumer 190 Other Contract Product Liability 380 Other Personal 720 Labor/Management SOCIAL SECURITY Protection Act 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Property Damage Relations 861 HIA (1395ff) 490 Cable/Sat TV 196 Franchise Injury 385 Property Damage 740 Railway Labor Act 862 Black Lung (923) 850 Securities/Commodities/ 362 Personal Injury -863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) Product Liability 751 Family and Medical Exchange Medical Malpractice Leave Act 864 SSID Title XVI 890 Other Statutory Actions REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS 790 Other Labor Litigation 865 RSI (405(g)) 891 Agricultural Acts 210 Land Condemnation 440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpus: 791 Employee Retirement 893 Environmental Matters 220 Foreclosure 441 Voting 463 Alien Detaince Income Security Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 895 Freedom of Information 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 442 Employment 510 Motions to Vacate 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff Act 240 Torts to Land 443 Housing/ Sentence 896 Arbitration or Defendant) 245 Tort Product Liability Accommodations 530 General 871 IRS—Third Party 899 Administrative Procedure 290 All Other Real Property 145 Amer. w/Disabilities 535 Death Penalty IMMIGRATION 26 USC 7609 Act/Review or Appeal of Employment Other: 462 Naturalization Application Agency Decision

950 Constitutionality of 446 Amer. w/Disabilities 540 Mandamus & Other 465 Other Immigration Other 550 Civil Rights Actions State Statutes 448 Education 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -Conditions of Confinement V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 2 Removed from 🗶 1 Original Remanded from 6 Multidistrict 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 8 Multidistrict Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Another District Litigation -Litigation -(specify) Transfer Direct File Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity) 29 U.S.C. § 621 and 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause:

Age and National Origin discrimination VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: X Yes VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): IF ANY JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

плос

MAG, JUDGE

Case 2:21-cv-11806-SJM-KGA ECF No. 1, PageID.12 Filed 08/05/21 Page 12 of 12 PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

| Court: | Is this a case that has been previously dismissed? the following information: | Yes X No |
|--------------|--|----------|
| 2. | Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.) | Yes X No |
| If yes, give | the following information: | |
| Court: | | |
| Case No.: _ | | |
| Judge: | | |
| Notes : | | |